DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 515 CE 062 670

AUTHOR	Karls, Doris K.; And Others
TITLE	Learning Partnerships: Lessons from Research Literature and Current Practice in Secondary Education.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Dec 92
CONTRACT	V051A80004-92A
NOTE	58p.; In "New Designs for the Comprehensive High School. Volume II--Working Papers"; see CE 062 664.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Development; Educational Research; High Schools; *Institutional Cooperation; Integrated Curriculum; Literature Reviews; Relevance (Education); Role of Education; *School Business Relationship; *School Community Relationship; School Organization; School Role; Secondary Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

Educational partnerships, i.e., partnerships between high schools and businesses, are a promising way of working together that is both old and new. The following features characterize collaborative partnerships: shared goals; mutual respect and trust; cooperative effort; shared power; contribution of varying talents, perspectives, and resources from each partner; and shared accountability. An historical perspective of partnerships in education can give some clues as to the barriers that might be experienced in movement to collaborative work and what might be learned from efforts that have been successfully implemented. One example of a barrier is that, during the last century, education has been conceptualized as a service delivery model rather than as a partnership. Movement to a partnership model of education requires a reorientation of educators, parents, administrators, and students away from a service delivery model. The success of apprenticeships, mentorships, and experiential learning opportunities in the past is renewing interest in replicating these methods in today's educational system. Five dimensions of paradigm shift in partnerships are as follows: movement away from activity-specific partnerships toward collaborative partnerships; movement toward social responsibility; strong interest in learner outcomes and learning processes; reconceptualization of education from a service delivery model to a partnership model; and bottom-up strategy for change. (Contains 85 references.) (YLB)

ED352515

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

LEARNING PARTNERSHIPS: LESSONS FROM RESEARCH LITERATURE AND CURRENT PRACTICE IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

by
Doris K. Karls
Virginia H. Pease
George H. Copa
Robert H. Beck
Kathryn Pearce

This paper was developed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U. S. Department of Education, for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. While this paper has undergone review by project staff and the project's external Design Group, this document has not been reviewed using the customary NCRVE manuscript review procedures.

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
University of California-Berkeley
University of Minnesota Site

CE062670

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEARNING PARTNERSHIPS: LESSONS FROM RESEARCH LITERATURE AND CURRENT PRACTICE IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

Considering the comprehensiveness of the learner outcomes as they relate to the personal, academic, vocational, and social development of each learner, and the active, experiential, and engaging nature of the desired learning processes, it is necessary to look beyond the traditional school boundaries and bell schedules for catalysts and resources that will nurture hoped-for aims. Some of the catalysts and resources needed are naturally occurring in the community surrounding the high school. The surrounding community includes the home and the extended family, volunteer and governmental community-based organizations, businesses, elementary schools, junior high schools, and postsecondary educational institutions. These individuals and institutions are important resources and partners in education. The purpose of this paper is to summarize and briefly analyze selected research literature and descriptions of current practice about partnerships for the high school.

Bronfenbrenner (1991) states that "the informal education that takes place in the family is not merely a pleasant prelude, but rather a powerful prerequisite for success in formal education from the primary grades onward" (p. 4). During the high school years of education, the family provides for the basic needs of the adolescent, such as a safe and secure place to live, food, clothing, and medical services; supervises the adolescent; guides and supports the adolescent's development and advocates for the adolescent. If these basic and supportive needs of the adolescent are not met, it is difficult for learning to take place. In these respects, the family is an essential partner in the academic, personal, vocational, and social development of high school students.

The National Association of State Boards of Education (1990) points out that communities are in a position to help develop aspects of education that schools are unable to provide. For example, students can learn the elements of citizenship such as respect for others, community responsibility, and social commitment. Work experience, community service opportunities, and academic projects in community settings provide unique learning experiences beyond the classroom. Also, public health and social service agencies become very important in providing for the basic needs of students if they are not being met in the home.

Partnerships between high schools and businesses are important in providing learning experiences that are experiential and contextual; establishing a link between classroom learning and future employment opportunities; and sometimes funding educational initiatives. Whether in the classroom, in the community, or at a business site, experiential learning involves structuring activities so that students face real life situations that challenge them to master and apply new skills, take responsible action, and reflect on learning. Businesses also facilitate alternative means of assessment of learning that simulate real life circumstances, and that provide students and teachers with a way of measuring growth and structuring future learning experiences.

Elementary and junior high schools are important partners because they should provide students with basic academic, social, and problem solving skills as well as guidance in the selection of a high school program. Basic skills combined with informed choices about high school offerings are prerequisites for success. Partnerships between high schools and postsecondary educational institutions: (a) involve the coordination of curriculum at different levels, (b) provide for a smooth transition for students from secondary and postsecondary education, and (c) prepare students for specific jobs.

Partnerships with families, communities, businesses, and elementary, junior high school, and postsecondary educational institutions are an important part of a comprehensive, ecological approach to school reform and restructuring because they link schools to the greater community which is an important part of the learning environment. Davies (1991) describes this ecological approach as school restructuring that is "directly linked to family and community factors and that recognizes the interconnectedness between the education of children and health, housing, economic, and social conditions" (p. 6). Partnerships between these various sectors and institutions are important to the development of students; the achievement of learner outcomes; and the facilitation of learning processes that are active, experiential, and engaging.

The purpose of this paper is to draw from and synthesize the literature on partnerships between high schools and the broader community. The hope is to identify examples, ideas, issues, and design specifications, that will be useful in new designs for the comprehensive high school of the 21st century. This paper will focus on partnerships that are learner-centered and that recognize the ecological aspects of school structuring.

This paper is divided into four major sections. The first section will clarify the meaning of the concept of partnership, examine various frameworks for classifying partnerships, isolate some general characteristics of partnerships, and offer some historical perspectives on partnerships.

The second section will identify some of the potential partners with schools in education; and for each partnership, the reasons or basis for the partnership, some prototypes of effective partnerships, and the costs and benefits of the partnership.

The third section of this paper will offer an analysis of the paradigm shift that may be necessary for educators to move to collaborative relationships with partners in education. Based upon the reports, position papers, and research studies reviewed for this paper, the summary portion of this paper will highlight some of the defining characteristics of partnerships and identify some key concepts and issues important to consider in designing partnerships.

Meaning of Partnership

Today, partnerships between schools and the private sector are truly a national movement permeating the entire education system (U.S. Department of Education, 1988). It is difficult to understand the meaning of the concept of partnership, however, as there are a wide array of terms used to describe these relationships—many of which are used interchangeably. Several authors (Corrigan & Mobley, 1990; Lieberman, 1986; Maurice, 1984) point to the fact that although the concept of partnership may be difficult to define, and partnerships (especially those involving collaboration) are complex to implement, they are important to educational reform.

The U.S. Department of Education defines an educational partnership as any cooperative effort between schools and the private sector to improve the quality of education. Merenda (1989) contends that in the private sector this broad definition could encompass a wide range of partners from individuals or small companies to large multimedia corporations or government agencies. This definition points to the need to think of partnerships at the local, state, national, and international levels. Beyond the private sector, the potential for partnerships is even broader and extends to families,

communities, elementary and junior high schools and postsecondary educational institutions. The structure and goals of these partnerships, Merenda suggests, are varied from one school and one partner to a group of partners nationwide with goals "including everything from reinforcing classroom instruction to improving employability skills, preventing drug abuse, providing internships for teachers, and providing summer employment opportunities for gifted or at-risk youth" (p. 5).

Dorothy Rich (1988) believes that the "real, best, and only way to improve education in this country is to combine the educational forces of home, school, and community" (p. 90). Rich describes the concept of partnership as the building of an infrastructure, which she feels up until now has been severely lacking. Developing an infrastructure, to Rich, means "connecting schools more formally to the rest of society—family, home, and environments outside of school in which children spend most of their time" (p. 92). This infrastructure could be built by launching a campaign about parents as educators, training teachers to work with families as partners, providing ways for families to help each other, involving senior citizens and the larger community in the children's learning process, and providing learning activities that families can use with their own children at home.

Another view of the concept of partnership is offered by Seeley (1985), who describes a partnership as "common effort toward common goals" (p. 65). Seeley contends that the following characteristics are essential to partnerships: (a) the relationship between partners is mutual; (b) the partners share an enterprise; (c) the partners, even though they may be strikingly different, each contribute particular talents, experiences, and perspectives; and (d) partners sometimes have different status within the relationship and control over the aspects of the work to be done.

Numerous terms have been used to describe the interrelationship between people or groups of people and are often used interchangeable with the term partnership. These terms include: cooperative, network, linkage, collaborative, consortium, coalition, and alliance. This use of multiple terms to describe partnerships can be problematic. When partners from different institutions or disciplines begin to work together, one of the first goals of that new partnership is often the clarification of terminology used by the partners.

To gain a better understanding of partnerships, three frameworks for classifying partnerships will be discussed. These three frameworks are: the Maurice framework (1984) which classifies partnerships by their degree or intensity; the Jones and Maloy model (1988) of partnership motivation; and the National Alliance of Business model (1987), which classifies partnerships by the level of involvement and the intensity/duration of that involvement.

Maurice recommends policy options for private sector involvement with vocational education that are also useful for the comprehensive high school and develops a framework to describe the meaning of some of the terms related to partnerships or what he calls "cooperative practices" (p. 8). Maurice places the "boundedness or maturity of cooperative relationships on a continuum based upon the degree or intensity of the relationship, ranging from no interaction to a symbiotic relationship" (p. 8). Maurice used the work of Ferrin and Arbeiter (1975) as the basis of the first four levels; he added the integrative level. These levels of association in cooperative relationships, as listed from lowest level of association (1) to highest level of association (5), are:

1. *Separation:* No information or resources are shared, and each organization maintains its own sphere of authority.

2. *Communication:* School seeks information and advice from industry, or vise versa, yet each still maintains separate spheres of authority.

3. *Cooperation:* Employer is involved in activities and provides resources.

4. *Collaboration:* Educational functions of both are considered; programs link the school and the workplace; no effort is made to modify either organization to accommodate the mutual objectives.

5. *Integrative:* Structures within cooperating organizations are modified to accommodate the objectives; a joint sphere of authority exists to accomplish the mutual objective; resources are merged; responsibility for success or failure is shared. (p. 8-9)

Maurice concludes from his study of the literature that "there is abundant cooperation between vocational education and the private sector; however, there is little collaboration and there are almost no relationships that can be described as integrative" (p. 81). Collaboration and integration represent the highest levels of cooperative maturity and

many authors in the field have asserted that these levels of maturity are where we should direct our vision.

Jones and Maloy describe a model of motivations for participation in partnerships. The appearance in most partnerships of divergent motivations result in *obliged to*, *ought to*, and *want to* assumptions. According to Jones and Maloy, *obliged to* conveys top-down pressure for organizational collaboration, such as court orders, funding conditions, or state policy requirements. *Ought to* prevails where leaders sense their organizations will benefit from partnerships in some as yet undermined ways. *Want to* describes the responses of those members of organizations who anticipate personal and professional gains from their involvement in proposed joint activities (p. 90).

Varied motivations produce differing personal and organizational perceptions about reasons for cooperative action. The chart below produced by Jones and Maloy shows nine possible contexts for negotiating cooperative activities.

		Outsiders' Motivations		
		Obliged to	Ought to	Want to
Insiders' Motivations	Obliged to	Mandated meetings & pro forma activities	?	Conflicting communication & activities
	Ought to	?	Formal meetings & uncertain outcomes	?
	Want to	Conflicting communication & activities	?	Agreements on shared activities & outcomes

Jones and Maloy point out that the ideal situation is the *want to/want to* motivations for both partners. *Ought to/obliged to* negotiations are problematic and less often lead to positive programs (p. 90-91).

The National Alliance of Business suggests a model that categorizes partnerships by the level of involvement within the organization (e.g., boardroom or classroom) and the intensity/duration (e.g., systemic change or one-time donation) of that involvement. Their Business-Education Matrix was developed from data on thousands of partnerships in existence in this country. The National Alliance of Business cautions about the difficulty with categorizing partnerships because they are dynamic, developing relationships:

> Often the more sophisticated partnership efforts begin quite modestly, and do not aim initially at more than limited, project-specific activity. Many then build on a progression of success, increasing their credibility, investment and trust among the partners. Over time, they broaden their agendas and the numbers of partners involved, taking on increasingly difficult problems on many levels at once, becoming multi-dimensional. (p. 13)

The levels of business-education partnerships as categorized by the National Alliance of Business are:

1. Partners in policy: Broadest scope of involvement and investment to push for education as a priority, legislative changes, and coordination of resources. Requires longest term agenda, five years and beyond for follow-through activities. Highest return on investment.

2. Partners in systemic educational improvement: Broad scope investment in planning, implementing and evaluating school improvement efforts. Requires long-term agenda, three to five years and beyond. Large scale projects requiring broad coalitions, maximum coordination, re-combining, and channeling resources to solve the community's problems.

3. Partners in management: Partners share in planning, coordinating, implementing, and evaluating activities. Requires a one- to two-year commitment. Activities may be large, medium, or small in scale.

4. Partners in professional development: Activities are generally shorter term, usually small or medium in scale. Requires one month to one year commitment. May be implemented by an individual company with the schools or may be part of a formal program for professional development.

5. Partners in the classroom: Activities to support or supplement classroom experience. Generally requires minimal investment covering one or more semesters.

6. Partners in special services: Generally one time, short-term, project-specific activities affecting one school, one class, or one student. (pp. 10-11)

In this model of categorizing partnerships, the National Alliance of Business suggests that each level on the continuum, from the bottom (special services) to the top (policy), represents an increasing amount of business involvement and investment and an increasing impact on the total high school system.

This section of the paper has attempted to clarify the meaning of the concept of partnership and, by presenting various models for categorizing partnerships, to show the wide variety of cooperative relationships that can be developed and implemented in education. The concept of partnership is difficult to define. However, from the literature review, the following general characteristics can guide the development of partnerships for the comprehensive high school. Partnerships are interrelationships between people or organizations in which there is: (a) some level of cooperative effort; (b) a shared goal, vision, or enterprise; (c) mutual respect and trust among partners; (d) the partners each contribute particular talents, experiences, perspectives, and resources to the partnership; (e) there is shared power in the partnership; and (f) there is shared accountability for what the partnership is attempting to accomplish. Partnerships are dynamic, growing, and evolving relationships. They usually start small and develop over time to more complex, sometimes multidimensional relationships. Partnerships are an important part of a comprehensive, ecological approach to school reform and restructuring because they link schools to the greater community, which is an important part of the learning environment.

Historical Perspectives

This section of the paper will examine the history of the relationship between secondary schools and families, communities, businesses, and postsecondary institutions. An historical perspective of partnerships in education can give some clues as to the barriers that might be experienced in movement to collaborative work. It can also offer insights into

the types of partnerships that have been effective in the past and how those efforts can be expanded upon now and into the future.

Historic Perspective of Family/Community Involvement in Education

Historically, there has not been clear distinction made regarding the contributions to education made as a result of partnerships between schools and families and between schools and communities. In nineteenth-century rural America, children acquired much of their moral, vocational, and academic learning from families and neighbors. Schools supplied only part of the education that a community provided. Tyack, (1974), notes that a child growing up in such a rural community could see work-family-religion-recreation-schools as an organically related system of human relationships. Tyack goes on to say that schools in such environments were often the focus of people's lives outside the home. Most rural patrons had little doubt that the school was theirs to control, and not the property of the professional educator. At that time, teachers were often friends or kin with those they taught, or they boarded in the homes of area families. Urban families and minorities did not experience this type of symbiotic relationship with schools. However, until after World War II, when consolidation would speed the demise of the one-room schoolhouse, the more symbiotic relationship persisted in rural America (Olson, 1990).

By the beginning of the 1890s, a far different model was developing in large urban districts. Olson points to the fact that "reformers asserted that industrialization and a growing immigrant population required a new kind of schooling: one that was more standardized, more bureaucratic, and run by professionals" (p. 19). As the organization of urban schools shifted, the locus of power moved with it: from the control of laypeople—including parents—to that of professional educators (Olson).

Some of the shift to a more institutionalized model of education was mandated by legislation. For example, in 1917 the shortage of skilled workers was one of the reasons for the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act that authorized the development of vocational schools. In another example, pre-schools were formed after television brought to the public's attention the inadequacy of some homes to provide the conditions thought essential for academic achievement.

With the professionalization of teaching and administration in the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, the feeling developed that professionals should make the decisions about what

education was best. By the 1950s, Olson continues, it was widely accepted that schools could do it all and that parents and community were no longer needed to educate children. Olson goes on to say that "the 1960s brought a revival of parent advocacy with the federally funded Title I program, however, the civil-rights conflicts of the 1960s also served to increase the distance between many schools and communities" (p. 19). In more recent years, efforts to shift key decisions about schooling to the state and district levels—and away from individual schools—have further alienated communities and families.

Today, "the relationships between most schools and parents range from polite but not intimate to wary and distrusting" (Olson, p. 18). Because of changes in the American family structure, stresses on the family, and the nature of the problems facing communities and schools, there is a renewed interest in schools, families, and communities working together as partners in education. But this will require a fundamental reorientation on the part of educators and parents and an understanding of prevailing attitudes that have developed through history.

Historic Perspective of Business Involvement in Education

Partnerships between business and education have an historic dimension that should be seriously considered. In the broadest sense, the master-apprentice relationship of mid-century European guilds is a legitimate ancestor. The master-craftsperson was responsible to teach a craft, a work ethic, and basic literacy. American apprentice relationships, whether on farms or in the trades, withered away by the 1880s; the diminished role affected by democratic values, industrialization, and resistance from worker's groups. Without this source of cheap, qualified labor, industrialists looked to farm families for surplus workers.

The industry-education partnerships in the New England mill towns from 1810-1830 existed for the young women workers who came to live and work at the mills until they returned home to marry. Life at the mill town was similar to a boarding school. Education was encouraged through study groups, literary forums, church attendance, and physical exercise (Eurich, 1985).

Industrialization stimulated the growth of large population centers and scientific farming. The family farm was transformed into a business enterprise as it produced food for urban residents. New links between education and farm prosperity were encouraged by

advocates such as the National Grange, and editors "Uncle Henry" Wallace, and former Wisconsin governor William Hoard. Legislation was passed at state and federal levels to provide scientific farming education for the agricultural classes (Cremin, 1964).

The Mechanics Institute of Boston, the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, and the manual training concept were early nineteenth century answers to the needs by the young men in workers' groups for education in sciences, mechanics, and invention. The institutes were good efforts in the ideals of general and industrial education but could not supply the numbers of educated workers demanded by industry. Expanding free public education to include industrial education, it was argued, would achieve two goals "the multiplying factories with their increasing technology needed workers with greater knowledge and skill, and workers with that education would be in a better position to deal with an increasingly oppressive factory system" (Eurich, p. 31).

One can look to Russia for the genesis of the industry-education partnership, Cremin says. The Russians displayed their system of technical education at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition of 1876. "Businessmen from New York, St. Louis, and Chicago who had seen the display began to sharply criticize the narrow intellectual emphasis in the American secondary school program, and demanded a central place for manual training and vocational education" (p. 21).

On display in the exhibit cases were the drawings, models, and tools illustrating the Della Vos methods. The Della Vos method organized instruction shops in each of the useful trades. In Russia, instruction shops all but eliminated the larger and less efficient construction shops. At that point in history, American education had not yet worked out pedagogy that would successfully tie together education and national progress in industry. The new method was a new beginning. "American education was never the same thereafter," according to Cremin (p. 21).

The links between business and education grew in number and complexity in the years leading up to the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. The influence of organized labor was also very important in the exchanges that put vocational education in the public high school, and in essence, established the comprehensive high school. The Act was the culminating event at the end of two decades of effort from business, labor, and social leaders to add an industrial-vocational dimension to the curriculum.

The Corporation School movement provided another example of business-education interface in the years surrounding the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act. Beginning as early as 1872, corporation schools were established by many of the large and dominant corporations, particularly in the eastern states and then western states of Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, and Ohio. The corporations provided a range of cultural, general, and industrial lessons to employees who had graduated or left school. The National Association of Corporation Schools, organized in 1913 by thirty-five of the largest corporations had a standing committee on public education for the purposes of studying and influencing the public school curriculum toward work ready graduates, particularly when it came to retail sales and factory apprenticeships.

In 1918, Albert Beatty of the Carnegie Institute of Technology and the Director of Education for the American Milling Co., published the results of a two-year study of corporation schools in which he recommended that the *cooperation school* be the desired form for vocational education within the guidelines of democracy.

Cooperation schools would bring together the strengths of public education (e.g., classroom management, definiteness of aim, assignment of lessons, breadth of view, development of culture, and recitation technique) and the superiority of the corporation school (e.g.,. responsiveness of class, mental discipline, and class attitude toward learning). "Cooperation schools would also take advantage of the inherent advantages of the corporation school in the relation of employer and employee, pecuniary interest, shop situation, and real problems" (p. 144). Beatty further concluded that the corporation school could not become universal because it reached only a small number of industrial workers, and business reasons required the corporation school to select the best and to eliminate the inferior applicants. Selectivity of the best students was the one feature that had arrayed the American Federation of Labor against any form of privately controlled vocational schools (Cremin, 1964).

In a resource bulletin (Spring, 1987) from the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, Turnbaugh suggests that by the 1930s and early 1940s, schools and businesses were united by the needs for job training, the New Deal youth agencies that attempted to mediate the effects of the Depression, and the patriotism surrounding the effort to win World War II. She concludes that today the use of high schools to prepare youth for jobs in seldom questioned, but a shifting economy has changed the significance of this

trend. The shifting economy of the 1980s and 1990s has once again brought the conversation between business and education loudly to the public ear.

Historic Perspective of Secondary/Postsecondary Partnerships

Secondary-postsecondary articulation and partnerships are not new concepts. Robertson-Smith (1990) points out that as early as the 1920s a system was established in southern California to provide a smooth transition for students in grades eleven to fourteen. The seventh yearbook of the National Education Association, published in 1929, was completely devoted to a discussion of articulation among educational institutions at all levels; and in 1947 "the need to provide easier transition from high school to college" was underscored in the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (Opachinch and Linkz, 1974, p. 1).

Articulated academic programs and credit received national attention in the 1950s with the Advanced Placement (AP) Program and the College Level Examination Board (CLEP). The AP program allowed secondary students to take college-level foundation courses while still in high school; they received advanced standing once they matriculated to a postsecondary institution. CLEP examinations allowed students to test out of beginning level courses at the postsecondary institutions (Robertson-Smith).

Articulation efforts began to lag behind need in the 1960s. According to Robertson-Smith, large numbers of community and technical colleges were being established across the nation, and equally large numbers of students were faced with the need to transfer credits into colleges and universities while keeping their existing credits intact. During the 1970s, a number of states began to establish statewide policies and procedures for articulation. Following a survey of state advisory councils, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education reported that by 1976 almost forty percent of the states responding had planned articulation programs between secondary and postsecondary levels of education.

By 1990, ten states had transfer agreements affecting all of higher education, and thirty of the fifty states had some credit transfer policies in place. The remaining twenty states had numerous individual agreements in force between or among individual institutions or segments of higher education. Tech-prep, one form of secondary-

postsecondary partnership "is built upon the theories and concepts of articulation that date to the mid-sixties and seventies" (Hoerner, 1991, p. 18).

The brief history of partnerships in education reveals that prior to the 1900s in rural America work-family-religion-recreation-schools were seen as an organically related system of human relationships. Families and communities were very much involved in educating the children. In the early 1900s industrialization and the professionalization of teaching and administration moved the locus of control for education from laypeople—including parents—to that of professional educators. Businesses have a long history of partnerships with schools in the forms of apprenticeships and corporation schools. These earlier models are prototypes for business-education partnerships today. Secondary-postsecondary articulation partnerships began as early as 1920. The Advanced Placement (AP) Program and the College Level Examination Board (CLEP) developed in the 1950s were the start of many of the secondary-postsecondary partnerships implemented today.

Potential Partners in Education

This section of this paper will identify some of the potential external and internal partners, who with schools, could contribute significantly to the comprehensive personal, academic, vocational, and social development of high school students. External partners come from outside the traditional school organization. Internal partners come from within the school organization. All of the partners mentioned help engage students in active, experiential, and contextual learning processes and assessments. Needless to say, this is not an exhaustive sampling of potential partners in education. For each of the potential partners identified, the following will be addressed: (a) the need for a partnership, (b) some prototypes of effective partnerships, and (c) the costs and benefits of partnership.

Davies (1991) points out that a student's world is composed of multiple institutions and sectors and that all parts of this world influence the development of the student. These influences are more likely to be strong and positive when there is communication and cooperation in the student's interest among the many parts. This ecological view is embodied in the African proverb: "It takes the whole village to educate the child." If one takes into account this ecological view of the student's world, then families, communities,

businesses, elementary schools, junior high schools, postsecondary educational institutions, and others from within the school are all potential partners in education.

Parents/Families as Partners in Education at the High School Level

Cavazos (1989) addresses the urgent need to equip our children for success in school through the active participation of their parents. As an aspect of education reform efforts nationwide, parent involvement takes several forms: (a) involvement can occur within the context of the home, as parents and other family members encourage and help their children and hold a positive attitude toward learning in the home; (b) in the roles parents take in relationship to the school and school system, ranging from volunteer work in the classroom to school governance; and (c) by the parents' choice of the schools their children will attend.

Researchers are beginning to examine the effects of various types of parental involvement in education. Parental involvement during the preschool years of child's development has been associated with reading readiness and interpersonal skill development (Collins, 1984; Tivnan & Pierson, 1982). The positive effects of parental involvement on elementary students' reading and mathematics achievement have been well documented (Epstein, 1984). A few studies have focused on the effects of various types of parental involvement on the grades of high school students (Eagle, 1989; Fehrman, Keith, & Reimers, 1987). However, much needs to be learned about what types of parent involvement are developmentally appropriate and effective at the high school level. Parents are important as ever to the social and academic success of their high school students, but their role necessarily becomes different as their child grows older (Henderson, Marburger, & Ooms, 1986).

An understanding of the unique needs and issues of the older adolescent (ages sixteen to nineteen) is important to developing parent-student-educator partnership strategies that have a chance of success. Parent and educator in-service or pre-service training to help develop effective partnerships at the senior high school level need to involve specific information about the older adolescent's developmental stage and how the dynamics of the family system differ at this stage. A profile of general characteristics and concerns of the late adolescent stage of development follows.

Erickson (1968) states that in no other stage of the life cycle is the promise of finding oneself and the threat of losing oneself so closely allied as they are in late adolescence. During the entire adolescent stage, identity formation is an important issue; however, in late adolescence, youth become better equipped to perceive their own uniqueness and come to grips with the way they are. Elkind (1984) believes that we "must not deny young people the time, support, and guidance they need to arrive at an integrated definition of self" (p. 21).

At the adolescent stage, several sources on adolescent development (Benson, 1990; Elkind; Mitchell, 1986) stress the importance of all adolescents having someone, usually an adult, who believes in them and appreciates their unique strengths. These mentors or special figures accept the adolescents for who they are. In fact, Rumburger (1987) suggests that the most important factor in preventing students from dropping out of high school is if their psychological need for someone to care about them individually is met.

Older adolescents develop their own private and personal standards by which they judge their self-importance (Mitchell, 1986). Self-importance becomes more strongly linked with competence; therefore, they feel important when they can do something important. Older adolescents identify themselves in terms of their involvement. The need for meaningful school and community involvements are very important to the older adolescent's development. Other needs of older adolescents are: (a) a desire and freedom to exercise their ability to make choices, (b) a value or system of beliefs to which they can be committed, (c) the desire for status in the adult world, and (d) the selection and preparation for an occupation (Mitchell).

As older adolescents are adjusting and responding to their unique needs and issues, the family system and school environment should be cognizant of these needs. The family system, including parents, grandparents, older children, and friends of the family, can provide much needed support to high school students to help them achieve social, academic, vocational, and personal goals. Small and Eastman (1991) list the following as developmentally appropriate involvement of the family with the adolescent:

1. Meeting basic needs such as a safe and secure place to live, adequate food and nutrition, clothing, and the ability to access medical, dental, and mental health services.

2. Monitoring of the adolescent involving supervision and awareness of the adolescent's behavior and whereabouts. This should not be done in an overly intrusive way, but parents should show an active interest in the lives of their adolescents, and a willingness to enforce rules and raise issues that concern them. Parenting style has been shown to have a relation to adolescent school performance (Dornbusch, Ritter, Lederman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987).

3. Teaching self-protection skills such as dealing with emergencies at home, dealing with peer pressure, and certain streetwise skills.

4. Guiding and supporting development, including setting limits, providing reinforcements and sanctions, communicating, and modeling the behaviors and values that are important to adolescents.

5. Advocating and supporting for their adolescents as a way of linking to experts, individuals, groups, and institutions. This function is particularly important because of the greater involvement of adolescents in institutions of the larger community, the multitude of choices contemporary teens need to make about academic issues and further vocations, and their precarious legal status. (p. 457)

Henderson et al. list the following as the most important functions of the family system in helping the high school student experience success: (a) continued monitoring and support of the adolescent's academic progress, (b) preparing for transition to work, and (c) guiding the social world of adolescents. If parents are to monitor the adolescent's school success, they need to be kept informed of school progress. Henderson et al. suggest that to make home-school communication easier, some schools are successfully creating administratively smaller units within the school, maintaining continuity of counselors throughout the high school years, and creating teams of teachers to teach a specific group of students for more than one year. Also, some high schools schedule periods when teams of teachers can regularly meet to avoid the fragmentation of a piecemeal progress report on any given student.

Technology is a valuable tool in communication with parents. Several schools nationwide have telephones supported by computer technology in place that allow parents or students to call in at any time of the day or night and receive information via recorded messages from any teacher about daily assignments, tests, and special events to be held such as SAT and ACT testing dates and sporting events. This allows the family to initiate contact with the school that is informative and non-threatening (Bausch, 1989).

Dorothy Rich, founder of the Home and School Institute in Washington, DC, believes that all families across all economic and racial lines care about their children and their schooling. However, Rich (1988a) contends that many families lack the help they need to turn their love into practical, school-supportive action at home. Rich emphasizes the ability of parents to use the curriculum of the home to develop the following Mega Skills in their children in age-appropriate ways: confidence, motivation, effort, responsibility, initiative, perseverance, caring, and teamwork. These skills, Rich believes, are foundational to the school success and later occupational success of all students.

In light of the fact that the world of work is so familiar to parents, schools are beginning to solicit the help of parents to accomplish the goal of preparing high school students for the transition to work. Henderson et al. explain that some parents have a broad exposure to the variety of jobs in the community and know where the job openings are occurring. Parents of high school students have in several schools been willing to share some of their time on a volunteer basis to come to school and discuss their own job situations, to take young students as interns for a brief period, or to act as volunteer counselors and mentors to another parent's teenager. These incentives engage the student, help to make the learning in the classroom more relevant, and provide important links to the greater community (Karls, 1992).

There are a variety of roles parents and other family members are performing in the schools. In Chicago, there is a parent-led council at each school that is instrumental in developing school improvement plans, and New York City is beginning to seek greater parental involvement in running some schools (Bacon, 1990).

Parent involvement in school governance and decision making is meeting the most resistance from the administration and staff of the schools. Parent involvement in governance and decision making is perceived by some administrators and teachers as "a

threat to the status quo within the schools and to the authority of educators" (Cavazos, p. 4). Educators who feel this way, limit contact with parents and fail to share information with them. They take a narrow view of the role of parents by insisting that only professional educators know what is best for their children, Cavazos says.

A prototype for involvement of parents in school governance and decision making is the *Comer process*, the model designed by James Comer, a professor of sociology at the University of Chicago. This process was first implemented in New Haven, Connecticut in 1968, and since then has been implemented in several sights throughout the country. Three components are essential to the Comer model: (a) the school planning and management team, a representative governance, and management group that includes parents; (b) the student-staff services team, which focuses on prevention of children's behavior problems and support for teachers dealing with children in crisis; and (c) parent involvement (McAllister Swap, 1990). In the Comer model, according to McAllister Swap, the emphasis on equity, shared power, accountability, and experimentation seems to sustain energy and ownership among the partners.

The National Association of School Boards of Education (NASBE) offers several examples of how parents have organized to become advocates for improving policies and resources for all schools in the district: (a) in Chicago, Designs for Change, Inc., a parent advocacy group, was instrumental in formulating legislation that restructured the public schools in that city; (b) in Washington, DC, Parents United has been extremely active in advocating for increased education spending and serves as a vocal forum for parents' concerns; and (c) early childhood programs such as Project Head Start have a record of success in involving parents in key personnel, program, and budget decisions.

Allowing parents to choose which school their students will attend is also thought to increase parent involvement in children's learning from the start, as parents learn what different schools have to offer (Cavazos; Nathan, 1989). According to Bacon, as of July 1990 eight states, led by Minnesota, had adopted plans that allow parents to register their students in any school in the state. Proponents of school choice feel it increases the support, responsibility, and accountability of parents in the education process.

The need for families to participate as partners in education with schools is clear. The examples given above are but a few strategies that have been successfully implemented

at the high school level. The benefits of involving families as partners in education are summarized by Scott-Jones (1988): Family participation "provides knowledge about the student not otherwise available to school personnel; infuses the family's values and background into the school; encourages students to believe that school is important to their families and that families belong to schools; and, results in teachers' feeling support from families for the school's goals" (p. 67).

NASBE lists the following specifications as important to any successful parent/family involvement initiatives:

1. Parents and schools must maintain effective lines of communication. Effective communication should be predominantly positive, frequent, and two-way.

2. School and family connections must take a developmental course and be sensitive to the students' development and stage of schooling.

3. Involvement initiatives must be sensitive and respectful of the diversity of families, including one-parent homes, reconstituted or blended families, foster homes, extended families, and a variety of other family situations.

4. Family involvement strategies require site specific development and leadership tailored to the nature of the school, its administrator, staff, community, and its families.

5. All involvement initiatives must recognize the need for training and time commitments. (pp. 6-8)

The major cost to schools of implementing effective family involvement strategies is time. Coordinated planning, collaborative work, and increased contact with families by phone, mail, or in person all take time. Schools may have to take a non-traditional approach to scheduling to allow for more family participation. The initial monetary cost of

installing technology that increases contact and communication with the home is quite expensive and the systems need to be maintained.

A transition to a partnership relationship with families may involve pre-service and in-service training for both teachers and parents. Teachers and parents should listen to each other and clarify their respective needs, goals, and perceptions about their role in a partnership. Working with parents requires different skills than working with students. Therefore, teachers and other school personnel require training in how to work with and understand the parents of their students. Likewise, parents may need training and guidance from teachers on how to effectively participate in their child's education. NASBE contends that "recognizing the substantial changes that are required in staff skills and school routines and practices, planning for successful parent/family involvement should assume a three-year time period for full implementation" (p. 8).

The attitude of school staff is a deciding factor in whether parents are productive partners with the school—not the parents' education, race, or the socioeconomic background of the families (Epstein, 1983; Moles, 1990). All families have strengths to share with schools. Both schools and families benefit from quality family involvement programs.

The Community as a Partner in Education at the High School Level

The community at-large, including any number of agencies, institutions, and citizens, is a potential partner with schools in education. Goodlad (1984) states that a very significant part of the academic/intellectual program of schools must be realized through experiences in the larger community. One of the central purposes of education is to help students learn how to be responsible, contributing members of the communities in which they live. The challenge for schools is to join forces with the community in order to provide opportunities for all students to learn responsibility and citizenship (NASBE).

Although there is not extensive research in the area of school-community partnerships, many teachers, administrators, and parents consistently testify to the positive impact of community involvement in schools (NASBE). Bryant (1986) makes the following statement concerning the efficacy of community involvement and the difficulty of implementing it: "A direct correlation has been shown between the motivation of a child to learn and the relevance of the learning process to life in the larger community outside the

school, but it has been difficult to find practical methods of directly involving the community in public day-school programs" (p. 25).

Boo and Docker (1985) also comment on the need and importance of community-school partnerships:

> Partnerships between schools and community agencies, whether public or private, can enrich the regular school curriculum. Community partnerships open up new worlds and new possibilities for youngsters, helping them see the connection between learning and living. Partnerships also develop community appreciation and support for the work of public educators. (p. 12)

Given the myriad of possible partnerships, the prototypes offered as examples here are selected to illustrate ways in which schools and communities can cooperate to improve education, including: (a) communities becoming involved in the day to day running of the schools by making available their time, experiences, and resources to the school; (b) communities allowing students to become actively involved in community life; (c) communities facilitating the coordination of needed services to students; and (d) schools becoming community centers for the entire community (NASBE).

Relatively simple and frequent types of support traditionally provided to schools by communities are guest speakers, special demonstrations, and allowing the use of facilities and equipment. These are important forms of cooperation, but do not involve the higher levels of partnership, including joint goals and planning, as in collaboration.

As mentioned earlier, important to the stage of late adolescence is the need for a significant adult or mentor to care about each student individually and to appreciate her/his unique talents. Mentorships may involve students, faculty, or administrators working with business, higher education, government, community-based organizations, or non-profit agencies. "Mentors provide students or school personnel with significant contact in the community that is not available to them in the school setting" (NASBE, p. 12).

Student mentorships generally involve a match between the student and a member of the community. A mentor should provide a positive role model for the student. An example is Mentors, Inc. in Washington, DC. The program is designed to keep average students on track rather than to assist students who are experiencing academic difficulty or

behavior problems. Mentors have weekly phone contact with the students, and see students personally at least once a month. The program is effective in giving students a sense that people outside the school care about their success.

Another type of mentoring is mentorships for teachers. These mentorships involve businesses, colleges, or universities sponsoring teachers in their professional growth and development. One example of a high school- university partnership is at Baylor College of Medicine. This partnership has contributed to the renewed confidence and enthusiasm of the teachers in the Houston public high schools. The project staff members found that the mentoring experience not only improved the teachers' mathematics and science teaching skills, but also increased their self respect and renewed their enthusiasm for teaching (NASBE, p. 13).

The Search Institute in Minneapolis, Minnesota conducted a study summarizing extensive data from more than forty-six thousand public school students in grades six through twelve. This study sought to determine the extent to which several internal and external assets affected the positive development of teenagers (Benson, 1990). *External assets* include such factors as positive relationships in families, friendship groups, schools and community, while *internal assets* reflect the teenagers personal convictions, values, and attitudes. The study suggests that the kind of help teenagers need most in growing up is usually supplied by a combination of family and surrounding community. The family provides rules, discipline, encouragement, and caring. The community makes available such things as educational experiences, community rules and expectations, friends, recreational experiences, and spiritual nurturance.

The Search Institute Study points out the importance of what is called prosocial behavior to a teenager's positive development. Prosocial behaviors cover a wide range of human actions—helping people in distress, donating time or energy to volunteer service organizations, attempting to reverse political, economic, and social injustice or inequality. The common thread among prosocial behaviors is the desire or intent to promote the welfare of others.

The importance of involving high school students in prosocial behaviors has spurred a variety of community service initiatives. NASBE states that "student community service is fast becoming a significant topic of national education policy discussion and that

this nascent effort to promote students serving their communities is a positive and potentially powerful tool in integrating schools and communities" (p. 13).

The National Youth Leadership Council can be helpful in identifying curricula and other resources to promote youth service in schools and community organizations. Churches and community groups often set aside time and make the connections to have teens do something to help others, such as painting a house, visiting the elderly, and cleaning up river beds. The National Peer Helpers Association has also instituted peer counseling training programs. This is a means of youth developing social competencies and being of service to other youth.

NASBE contends that schools are a place where social service organizations should feel at home. In several cities, such as Boston, New York, and Baltimore, the local Boys and Girls Clubs are working closely with schools to develop dropout prevention programs, mentoring relationships, and career awareness projects (NASBE).

Many successful youth service programs have been implemented and are being replicated and expanded to new settings. However, any youth service program has to keep the needs of the respective community in mind and also consider that one kind of program cannot apply to all students and all schools.

The emotional and physical wellbeing of students is essential to achievement of all other educational outcomes. Interagency partnerships between schools and human service providers are being forged to implement comprehensive prevention, treatment, and support services that students and their families need. The Education and Human Services Consortium (EHSC, 1991), offers several examples of how schools in collaboration with human service providers can improve the accessibility and comprehensiveness of services to students. Many of the efforts nationwide involve co-location of services and a realignment of resources to better meet the needs of students. For example, in 1988 the Kentucky Integrated Delivery System (KIDS) initiative began as a joint venture between the State Department of Education and the Governor's Cabinet of Human Services. Its purpose is to help local agencies develop mechanisms to coordinate existing services to make the services of social workers, mental health counselors, public health professionals, and others available at school sites. No new funds were attached to this venture. The

various agencies and the school personnel have common goals, a shared vision, shared planning, and are sharing some resources, making this a collaborative effort.

Two other examples of collaboration efforts between schools and human service providers are the Community School Program (CSP) in New York and the Ahora Program in Cambridge. The CSP initiative, which began in 1987, is designed to build school/community collaborations, promote instructional change and year-around schooling, and organize schools as sites for access to a wide range of social, cultural, health, recreation, and other services for children, their families, and other community adults. The Ahora Program in Cambridge, MA is a bilingual, multi-cultural youth enrichment program located at the Cambridge Rindge and Latin School and is a partnership between Concilio Hispano de Cambridge and the Cambridge, MA school district. Envisioned as a "bridge to the future," Ahora provides tutoring, mentorship, higher education and financial aid counseling, job counseling, leadership development, and recreational and cultural activities to over two hundred fifty Latino students each year (EHSC).

The examples provided in this section are but a few of the ways that community-school partnerships can provide resources, mentorships, community service opportunities, and comprehensive services to students. EHSC points to the following factors as important to the success of any collaborative efforts: (a) climate in which initiatives begin; the processes used to build trust and handle conflict; (b) the people involved; (c) the policies that support or inhibit their efforts; and (d) the availability of resources to enable the efforts to continue. NASBE suggests the following design specifications for any successful school- community partnership: (a) management and skillful organization, including a clear and concise listing of responsibilities and expectations of the partners; (b) flexibility of organization and implementation; (c) time commitment; and (d) training of teachers, administrators, and community representatives.

Different community organizations provide substantially different benefits to schools. Improved school-community relationships do require a time commitment by both partners. All communities have strengths to contribute to the education of their youth.

Businesses as Partners in Education at the High School Level

According to futurists Cetron and Gayle (1991) the easiest forecast for the 1990s is that "American business will become ever more deeply involved in our schools" (p. 81).

They report that the trend has been building for a decade because "business leaders have taken a long, hard look at America's schools, and they do not like what they see" (p. 82). Employers are supposed to win a competition with the Japanese, who have the highest average literacy level, but are claiming that as many as sixty percent of high school graduates are not prepared for entry-level jobs.

Cetron and Gayle also report that two-thirds of American companies say that education is their number one community relations concern. The National Center for Education Statistics figures show more than 140,000 business-education partnerships sponsored by industry and private foundations. More than forty percent of elementary and high schools participated in partnerships; by the year 2000 this percentage is predicted to reach one hundred percent. The amount of direct and indirect funding is rising rapidly. For example, in 1987 the Council for Aid to Education estimated that direct corporate donations to K-12 education was $200 million. The authors conclude that in 1990 "there is hardly a Fortune 500 company that is not involved in the schools of every community where it has a major presence. Many mid-sized companies have followed their lead. In the 1990s this trend will gain such momentum that no school system in need of help will have to go without it" (p. 89).

In a review of literature on the rationale for public-private collaboration in work force preparation, Smith and Trist (1988) discuss their finding about three broad questions. The first question was "What forces are shaping the work force and the need for skills in that work force?" The literature suggests that the need for better and more linkages is aimed at improving national economic competitiveness, and increasing equity in access to the job market for disadvantaged groups. The second question asked was "What are the implications of the resulting changes both in the work force and workplace for training and education activities and for collaboration between the public and private sectors?" The authors found, given the looming shortage of skilled labor, that the interests of the economy and of individual equity are converging as the need for better and more widely distributed skills grows.

The third question they researched was "What current partnerships seem to offer the most promise in addressing education and training needs in the decade to come?" Smith and Trist concluded that the traditional and uncoordinated modes of work force preparation still prevail. Consensus on most promising partnerships is hindered by two unresolved

issues: (a) on the level of content and substance, there is real debate about how much and what kind of education is enough; and (b) on the level of organization, there is little clarity about which institutions should handle which role in training the nation's work force.

Connections between major partnerships initiatives in the 1980s and the budding initiatives in 1992 can be seen by examining the record. The National Alliance of Business (NAB) provided a summary of partnerships that were significant fire starters in the first half of the 1980s and references several classic and prototypic partnerships that appear in contemporary form in the 1991 W. T. Grant report. For example, the American Express Philanthropy program became the Academies of Finance; the Portland Leaders Roundtable reappears as statewide legislation for Workforce Development Fund; and the Parker Project set the stage for the Wisconsin School to Work Transition Initiative.

At the national level, a business-education partnership has been appointed to administer the U.S. Department of Education; Lamar Alexander, former governor of Tennessee, and David Kearns, former chairman of Xerox Corporation, hold the top jobs. As part of President Bush's America 2000 education initiative, the Department of Education sanctioned the formation of the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC). NASDC is a limited-lifetime, non-profit corporation funded by American businesses, and intends to support a number of design teams organized to: (a) Create and test designs for schools that achieve national education goals and meet world class standards for all students and help these students leave school prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment; and (b) assist communities across the nation to adopt and recreate these designs for their own purposes (NASDC, 1991). NASDC is a $200 million initiative by big business to involve itself in: (a) systematic restructuring of public schools; (b) development and support of national educational goals; and (c) the establishment of federal, state, and local policy. It is the latest and most visible business-education partnership, following a decade of partnership activity that increased in both number and in intention.

Currently, newer partnerships are forming around the purposes of learning and learning process. We are seeing more interest in apprenticeships (W. T. Grant Report), mentoring (Freedman, 1991), and community service (Conrad & Hedin, 1989; Kielsmeier & Jackson, 1989; Luce et al., 1988; NASBE, 1991). Partnerships are also forming around

philanthropic (Meade, 1991), motivational (Shanker, 1990), and policy (W. T. Grant Report) issues.

The W. T. Grant report begins with the statement, "The United States is awakening to the dangers of complacency . . . . The need to build effective links among schooling, training, and the workplace has never been more urgent. The case for greater investment in the preparation of a 21st century workforce has never been more compelling" (p. 5). The publication presents in digest form fifty examples of initiatives to prepare a world-class workforce. The examples are a "kaleidoscope" of what is going on around the country; and most involve partnerships between the school and business and industry. The publication is organized around nine themes: (a) coordinated human resource investment planning bodies; (b) schools to employment transitions; (c) student apprenticeship; (d) technical preparation (Tech Prep); (e) youth community service; (f) employers as active partners in education and training; (g) alternative learning centers; (h) new pathways to postsecondary education; and (i) creative funding mechanisms for human investment.

Future Direction of Partnerships

The increased scope of business-education partnerships noted by the above report appears evident to The Conference Board (1991). The Conference Board exists to enable senior executives from all industries to explore and exchange ideas of impact on business policy and practice. It points to the first of several new directions for partnerships between business and education, that of improved learner outcomes and learning processes. They comment:

> As seasoned observers of the school reform process, we believe that the next wave of business involvement in education improvement has begun. While traditional business-education partnerships continue to benefit students, teachers, and local school operations, major new initiatives... mainly largely "experimental" . . . are being developed to improve instruction and learning. (Conference Board, 1991)

A second new direction is toward accountability and evaluation. These new initiatives are competing for the leadership and financial assistance of the business community. At the national level, President Bush's New Generation of American Schools project is heavily dependent upon business leadership. Locally, business leaders are strongly supporting school-based management and school choice programs. At the same

time, major corporate leaders involved in the Business Roundtable program are advocating school reform through state legislative action.

As the scope and intent of partnerships increase, the cost to all of the actors will increase. This may cause concern for corporate philanthropists, according to Weisman (1991a). He reports that SchoolMatch, a for-profit business, recently expanded its operation to evaluate school-business partnerships. He also reports that the United States Department of Education awarded a $1.5 million contract to the Southwest Regional Education Laboratory in California to evaluate partnerships and to develop replicable assessment models. The National Association of Partners in Education is soon to release a *how to* manual for partnership evaluation. This is a trend that may follow the increased investment in school-business partnerships.

The third new direction suggested in the literature is the shift from fiscal independence to co-location of services paid for by general and fiscally-dependent governmental budgets. The movement to open the doors between public school, business, and other public social services is aimed to enhance the learning readiness of the child (Broder, 1991; CED, 1991; NASDC, 1991). The New Vista high school for teenage mothers at Honeywell, Inc. headquarters in Minneapolis (Broder) and the Texas Instruments, Inc. partnership, called the Cone Center, in Dallas, (Donnely, 1991) combine the talents of industry, public schools, and university; the benefits of schooling and social services; and the commitment of parents.

The literature on business-education partnerships also includes limitations and cautions. Cremin, as well as other observers, suggests that mistrust, misunderstanding, and misrepresentations of interests is nothing new in school-business partnerships. Much of this is a manifestation of differing beliefs and values about education and private enterprise. In *The Work of Nations*, author Robert Reich, as reported by Weisman (1991b), contends that the business community's expressed interest in school improvement belies their attempts to avoid paying their share for it. Corporate munificence is a high-profile affair. Lobbying for huge tax breaks is, conveniently, far less so. Reich also shows no sympathy for the claims of $30 billion annual training costs by big corporations—he claims that amount goes into management and executive education.

Reich's critical viewpoint is also expressed by Jack Gordan (1990), editor of *Training* magazine and author of "Can Business Save the Schools." A recent commentary by Gordon (1991) in the *Minneapolis Star Tribune* newspaper included these remarks:

> Critical thinking sometimes shows up on the business community's wish list, as a matter of fact. But nobody explains how the schools are supposed to accommodate business' real desire in this area, which is for a nation of workers whose critical faculties come with an off-switch; workers who think deeply and well about process improvements that will let the company operate with fewer people, but lapse into sublime stupidity when listening to management's assurances that they won't just improve themselves out of a job. (p. A-13)

In a paper presented to the Council of Chief State School Officers, Benson (1991) argues that good public high schools should provide both education and enlightenment, even if not all economists and employers agree that our future rests upon the shoulders of a workforce adept at thinking about work, at work. He cautions:

> Better to be on the side of caution. If America does need a thinking workforce, if the *command economy* of the large size workplace is to give way to reliance on decentralized decisions of individual workers, then attributes of high schools with character appear important, particularly contextual or situational learning, and the inculcation of the habits of mind associated with cooperative learning. (p. 26-27)

Business-education partnerships are built on a need for a skilled work force to improve national economic competitiveness and increase access to the job market for disadvantaged groups. The possibilities for business-education partnerships are numerous. New directions for business-education partnerships include: improved learner outcomes and learning processes; movement toward accountability and evaluation; and a shift to co-location of social and educational services within public schools. Even though numerous business-education partnerships have been implemented, there is not consensus about what types offer the most promise in addressing the education and training needs of the future.

Elementary Schools and Junior High School as Partners with High Schools

Elementary schools and junior high schools are natural partners with high schools in that they supply the high schools with their students. Partnerships between these institutions often involve: (a) curriculum scope and sequence efforts among grades K-12; (b) career exploration in junior high school as preparation for high school course selection,

and (c) opportunities for elementary and junior high school students to achieve the basic skills necessary as a prerequisite for high school study.

One example of a curriculum scope and sequence effort K-12 is the Minnesota Agriculture in the Classroom Partnership (M-AIRC). M-AIRC is a broad-based education program helping students in grades K-12 gain agriculture knowledge. It is a public/private partnership between the State Department of Agriculture and many supporting organization from both the agriculture and education communities in Minnesota. M-AIRC is helping young people to learn about the source of their food supply and the role of agriculture in society. In the various components of this program K-12 it is stressed that agriculture is at the heart of global dependence and interdependence. It also points to the importance of students being agriculturally literate in order to make responsible and moral decisions—personally and collectively—about this giant global lifeline (Withers, 1991).

Many school districts encourage joint planning and curriculum scope and sequence efforts between the elementary, junior high school, and senior high school levels. This is an important part of providing developmentally appropriate learning opportunities relevant to a discipline (such as mathematics) or a concept (such as global interdependence). If scope and sequence planning and programming are implemented students will increase their chances of achieving the learner outcomes as they will build on knowledge gained at prior grade levels to achieve at succeeding levels. Scope and sequence efforts also provide for a smooth transition from one educational level to the next without unnecessary duplication of subject matter.

The Educational Options Unit of the Youth, Adult, and Alternative Educational Services (YAAES) of the California Department of Education (1991) issued a report entitled *Roads to The Future: Strategic Plan for Educational Options in the 21st Century*. In this report, YAAES examined ways to improve the linkage between vocational education and other educational options. YAAES contends that junior and senior high schools focus their attention on preparing students for college but do little to prepare students for employment. They contend that junior and senior high schools need to place particular attention on how educational options can be used to increase the skills and learning capacities of youth oriented toward employment after high school.

Junior high school programs that incorporate skill development and career exploration prepare students to make informed choices about future employment opportunities. Career exploration can expose students to new opportunities for employment and the coursework necessary to be prepared for the higher skill level needed for the jobs of the future. "New occupations are being created, and new technologies are shifting the job specific skills of long standing occupations" (YAAES, p. 4). To be poised for such changes, career exploration is important at the junior high school level.

To be successful in achieving learner outcomes at the senior high school level, elementary and junior high school students need to be provided with opportunities to achieve the basic skills necessary as a prerequisite for high school study. Basic skills development in the traditional *core* subjects of mathematics, science, English, and social studies are necessary along with social skill development, career exploration, problem solving, and critical thinking skills. Achievement in these areas at the elementary and junior high school levels can greatly enhance the possibilities of success at the senior high school level. Partnerships between senior high schools and elementary and junior high schools in the same district become very important to students.

Postsecondary Institutions as Partners with High Schools

Postsecondary institutions are increasingly establishing partnerships with secondary schools. These initiatives often involve the coordination of curricula at different levels; provide for a smooth transition for students from secondary education to postsecondary education; or, prepare students with the skills needed to perform specific jobs. This section will review partnerships between secondary and postsecondary educational institutions that facilitate the learner outcomes and learning processes, and that foster the personal, academic, vocational, and social development of students. Although this is not a comprehensive review of such partnerships, examples will be given of the types of partnerships that can be developed to benefit students.

Partnerships between secondary and postsecondary institutions aimed at coordination of curricula and a smooth transition for students are often called articulation programs. A broad definition is offered by Hull (1990), "articulation is a process for coordinating the linking of two or more educational systems within a community to help students make a smooth transition from one level to another without experiencing delays, duplication of courses or loss of credit" (p. 11).

One of the most comprehensive descriptions of articulation was written by Con and Hardy (cited in Hull). This definition describes articulation as a process, attitude, and goal. According to Con and Hardy:

> As a *process*, articulation is the coordination of policies and practices among sectors of the education system to produce a smooth flow of the students from one sector to another. As an *attitude*, it is exemplified by the willingness of educators in all sectors to work together to transcend the individual and institutional self-interest that impedes the maximum development of the student. As a *goal*, it is the creation of an educational system without artificial divisions, so that the whole educational period becomes one unbroken flow, which varies in speed for each individual, and which eliminates loss of credit, delays, and unnecessary duplication of effort. (p. 11)

These definitions point to the important reasons for increasing articulation between secondary and postsecondary institutions. These are: (a) to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of educational institutions at all levels, (b) to help students make a smooth transition from one level of education to another, (c) to eliminate delay, duplication of courses, or loss of credit, (d) to encourage the maximum development of each student, (e) to help students accomplish the same educational goals in a shorter time, and (f) to facilitate higher educational accomplishment in the same time (when compared to un-articulated programs). Robertson-Smith also includes financial restrictions, retention of students, and fostering excellence in technical and basic skills as reasons for secondary and postsecondary institutional articulation.

Some of the reasons for increasing articulation between secondary and postsecondary institutions listed above affect the institutions themselves and others more directly affect the student. The following section will focus on articulation initiatives and partnerships that directly affect the development of students and that facilitate accomplishment of the learner outcomes and learning processes identified in the previous working papers.

Articulation as a form of partnership to coordinate curricula and provide a smooth transition for students can occur in a variety of ways between secondary and postsecondary institutions. For example, as explained by Robertson-Smith, in terms of vocational-technical education, the occupational programs of comprehensive high schools, area vocational schools, and joint vocational schools can be closely and carefully aligned with

related programs at two-year technical colleges, junior colleges, community colleges, or proprietary schools; secondary occupational programs can also be coordinated with the related occupational programs offered by four-year colleges and universities. Likewise, two-year postsecondary occupational programs can be coordinated with related four-year programs in colleges and universities. Articulation can even occur across multiple educational levels: secondary programs can be coordinated with two-year postsecondary programs that are, in turn, coordinated with four-year postsecondary programs.

Bragg and Phelps (1990) explain that several types of models exist for secondary/postsecondary articulation, including time-shortened or advanced placement, advanced curriculum, and tech prep. Time-shortened or advanced placement models provide students with credit or advanced standing for postsecondary requirements completed before high school graduation. As a consequence of enrolling in time-shortened programs, students can complete their associate degrees in less than the standard two-year period, typically in one to one and a half years, saving tuition and forgone income.

A second type of model is referred to as advanced curriculum, which includes 4 + 2, 2 + 2, or 2 + 2 + 2. Bragg and Phelps point out that "these models tend to be highly coordinated and sophisticated in the sequencing and structure of courses provided between the various levels of education" (p. 8). The 4 + 2 and 2 + 2 programs are based on continuous six- or four-year curriculum covering grades nine or eleven through fourteen. The 2 + 2 + 2 model provides for a six-year articulation plan for the secondary level (grades eleven and twelve), the two-year college (grades thirteen and fourteen), and the remaining two years of a four-year college level (grades fifteen and sixteen). Bragg and Phelps suggest that successful advanced curriculum programs typically have joint facilities, faculty, advisory committees, and coordinators. Advanced curriculum programs allow the students to exit the programs with a certificate at the end of grade twelve, thirteen, or fourteen.

A third model of articulation between secondary and postsecondary institutions is the technical-preparatory, or Tech Prep, model. The tech prep model provides a common core of learning and technical education based on mathematics, science, communication, and technology in an applied setting. Bragg and Phelps explain that beginning with the junior year in high school, students receive coursework in applied science, mathematics, communications, and technology. More intense education specifications are developed

during the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the postsecondary level in such areas as agriculture, nursing, electronics, telecommunications, computers, business, marketing, entrepreneurship, and the construction trades. However, tech prep programs are not limited to only these areas.

Hoerner contends that "tech prep is an educational concept whose time has come" (p. 18). He goes on to say that several efforts and initiatives support the tech prep concept, such as: (a) the importance of serving the needs of all students; (b) the need to align education with the world of work; and (c) the importance of preparing all high school students for employment and further education.

The tech prep concept has the potential to expand since the U.S. Congress passed the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990. The Tech-Prep Education Act was a part of the Perkins Act and allocated $63.4 million dollars for the first year of the act. This funding is allocated to states by formula, and is designed to provide tech prep planning and implementation grants to a consortia of schools (Congressional Record, 101st Congress, 2nd Session, August 2, 1990).

A Work Incentive Model for a 2 + 2 tech prep program, discussed by Hoerner, recommends that employers assume a full role by contributing work-based experiences throughout the four years of the tech prep program. In this model, employers not only assist with a variety of work-based experiences such as cooperatives, internships, on-the-job training (apprentice) activities, and paid summertime employment experiences. This partnership with business and industry would provide contextual learning experiences for students and help adolescents gain status in the adult world, which is so important to their development.

Mount Hood Community College in Gresham, OR has had tech prep arrangement with its eight feeder high schools since 1987. North Carolina first implemented a pilot tech prep program in 1986. Today, programs are in place in thirty sites in that state. According to the directors of these programs, the advantages to students are as follows: (a) students receive recognition, including AP credit; (b) students are directed toward higher paying jobs; (c) students receive education which is application-oriented and promotes teamwork; and (d) students have an opportunity to attend community colleges and technical colleges prior to a four-year university, which for some is more intimidating (Willis).

Although the models of time-shortened or advanced placement, advanced curriculum, and tech prep are some of the most common types of secondary/ postsecondary articulation partnerships, others are worth noting. Two examples are: (a) arrangement for transfer credit whereby the course credits of two-year college graduates are transferred to a four-year college when the graduate enters, assuring advanced placement; and (b) postsecondary enrollment options (PSEO) which allows eligible students to enroll in courses at technical colleges or colleges and universities that are comparable to high school courses and get both college and high school credit. A postsecondary enrollment option has been instituted in Minnesota.

Another example of secondary/postsecondary articulation is that between specialized, career oriented high schools and two-year or four-year public educational institutions. Illustrative of this program is Aviation High School in New York City. This high school offers New York students an opportunity to specialize in aviation mechanics and careers related to engineering while receiving a solid academic background (Benson, Mitchell, & Russell, 1989). At Aviation High School, a link with a local community college allows students to work toward a second license and an Associate's degree. This program combines the two-year community college with Aviation High School so that students may attend the college and the high school simultaneously if they have an aviation diploma. Two years after graduating from high school they have an Associate's degree and a second license.

Also important to mention are high school/four-year university partnerships. Coordinating organizations exist that encourage and provide resources for school-university collaborative efforts. Ascher (1988) lists these organizations and their major functions: (a) The College Board's Educational Equality Project Models Programs for School-College Collaboration focuses on projects that change schooling through improving teaching or curriculum; (b) The Council of Chief State School Officers School/College Collaboration is directed at state education projects to plan collaborative efforts; (c) The National Association of State University and Land-Grand Colleges' University/Urban School Collaborative focuses on transition problems of urban youth as they move from high school to postsecondary education or the workplace, and (d) Academic Alliances that are local groups of public school and college teachers in particular disciplines who take collective responsibility for the quality of each other's teaching and learning.

Numerous secondary-postsecondary articulation and partnership initiatives have been highlighted in this section. Although there are many effective initiatives in place, Day (1985) identified critical problems that could inhibit articulation efforts: (a) turf issues of institutions, especially in a time of declining enrollments; (b) scheduling problems; (c) differences in contracts and workload between secondary and postsecondary staff; (d) attitudes held by staff related to competition, fear of loss of budget, the perceptions of each other; and (e) communication difficulties.

As in other partnerships previously discussed in this paper, secondary/ postsecondary partnerships require time for planning and implementing and also require staff inservice in order to be effective. Also important to secondary/ postsecondary articulation efforts is the availability to students of informed, skillful counselors to help students make choices about courses, schools, and career options.

Internal Partnerships at the High School Level

The potential partners discussed thus far in this paper have been those who could be classified as external partners. That is, they are partners from outside the school building. In the process of conceptualizing new designs for the comprehensive high school, it is also important to look briefly at partnerships that are internal, or within the school building. Such partnerships include the relationships between the students themselves; between the students and teachers; between both the students and staff and the administration; and between the alumni and the school.

Seeley (1985) points to the fact that the concept of partnership is fundamental to any learning. He states, "The fact that students must be in partnership with whoever is immediately teaching them, is the most fundamental element in any educational policy" (p. xvii). Seeley contends that whether or not public school systems choose to move to effective learning partnerships, there are several examples that show it can be done. Some of these are

> programs that exemplify small scale; more voice and choice for students, teachers, or both; more opportunity for student responsibility; more opportunity for teacher initiative; more parent involvement; more emphasis on the school or learning group as a "family"; and more emphasis on mutual goals, respect, and loyalty among the participants. (p. 216)

Seeley also suggests the use of cooperative learning to support the classroom as the key unit in achieving mutually supportive family-type values. The cooperative classroom can help achieve the goal of mastery of skills and outcomes by all students in the classroom.

Bryk and Driscoll (1988) contend that the social organization of the secondary school directly affects administrators' and teachers' work and may influence a variety of outcomes for students. Based on a review of recent literature, Bryk and Driscoll see three core concepts comprising a communal school organization:

> (a) a system of shared values among the members of the organization, reflected primarily in beliefs about the purposes of the institution, about what students should learn, about how adults and students should behave, and about what kinds of people students are capable of becoming; (b) a common agenda of activities designed to foster meaningful social interactions among school members and link them to the school's traditions; and (c) a distinctive pattern of social relations, embodying an ethos of caring that is visibly manifest in collegial relations among the adults of the institution and in an extended teacher role. (p. 5)

Bryk and Driscoll found that the consequences of the organization of a high school as a community included: increased teacher satisfaction; an increased social bonding of the students to the school and the core activities and goals; and a decrease in the incidence of dropping out because the students felt they belonged to something of value.

The importance of building collaborative partnerships between administrators and teachers, and between the teachers themselves is discussed by Smith and Scott (1990) in their book, *The Collaborative School.* They believe that collaboration is intended to facilitate instructional effectiveness. They list the following elements as essential to a collaborative school: (a) a belief that the quality of education is largely determined by the school site; (b) a school environment characterized by collegiality and continuous improvement; (c) a belief that teachers are professionals who should be given responsibility for the instructional process and held accountable for the results; (d) the use of a wide range of structures and practices, and (e) the involvement of teachers in decisions about school goals and the means of achieving them.

In a collaborative school, teachers share formally and informally about learning outcomes and learning processes; they are encouraged to and respected for trying new ideas; and, they support each other and believe increasingly that all students can learn. Some of the practices that help build collaborative partnerships among teachers, according

to Smith and Scott, are peer observation, peer coaching, teaching clinics, mentor programs, and teacher support teams. If a school is to be collaborative, administrators must believe in collaboration and encourage it; share authority for matters traditionally assigned to them; and, help to empower teachers to take part in goal setting, allocating school resources, and overseeing their professional development (Smith and Scott).

In addition to the internal partnerships of teacher-teacher, teacher- student, student-student, and teacher-administrator, the alumni of a school can be important partners. Since they know the internal culture of the school, they can provide important links from the school to the external community and places of employment. They can also serve as mentors, guest speakers, career counselors, peer tutors, and teachers. An example of the benefits to the school of a strong alumni association is the Aviation High School in New York City. Here the alumni play an important role in providing mentorships and scholarships for present students, as well as joining the regular teaching and administrative staff of the school.

Paradigm Shift in Partnerships in Education

In *Partnerships for Improving Schools* (1988), Jones and Maloy used a case study methodology to understand the role of partnerships in school improvement. "Three important analytic concepts from social science were used to ask why multiple realities, ill-structured problems, and reflexive thinking characterize viable partnerships" (p. 14). Multiple realities are represented in the different agendas, ideas, norms, and beliefs of the partners. Ill-structured problems have ambiguous and unclear answers that vary in their definitions and over time; outsiders often add the element of ill-structuredness to schools which tend to like well-structured problems. Reflexive thinking involves a self-consciousness about one's perspective that leads to shifts in how one perceives self in the organization. Understandings evolve when individuals or organizations work in partnership. The partnership relationship often helps individuals or organizations to change their ways of interpreting the world and to gain perspective on where they are or have been.

In their analysis of school partnerships, with an eye to the transformation of schools, Jones and Maloy strongly support collaborative (also called interactive) partnerships instead of the activity-specific cooperative relationships that have characterized many of the educational partnerships in the past. Their recommendation is based upon

three propositions and represents the first way in which we are seeing a paradigm shift in partnerships:

> 1. When teachers associate with colleagues and people from other organizations to exchange benefits, partnerships generate mutual learning processes. The resulting empowerment counteracts the frustration, isolation, and organizational stasis experienced by many educators; communication about personal and organizational constraints is enriched.
>
> 2. As people from different organizations, or different parts of the same organization interact, participants play new roles and develop new relationships. Experiencing new activities in different settings fosters both personal and organizational growth and development.
>
> 3. After learning new roles and experiencing other organizational cultures, partners infuse daily activities with alternative understandings about teaching and education. (p. 11)

Jones and Maloy point out that collaborative partnerships are a means to an end, not an end in themselves. Partnerships create possibilities for education so that future societies may hold greater choices. They say that "school partnerships will develop little of their potential unless they: (1) engage teachers as active decision makers; (2) help schools and their communities agree on goals, standards and implementation plans; and (3) stimulate discussions among insiders and outsiders over educational purposes related to both equality and quality "(p. 156).

Authors Jones and Maloy emphasize the transformative possibilities of school partnerships when they involve the voices from all of the stakeholders and when they redistribute the power more equitably among the partners. Shared activities with outsider partners will raise troublesome issues and require mutual accommodation, but the promise of new insights and unanticipated outcomes is also real and compelling. Teachers may explore new definitions of professionalism and shape evolving strategies and structures of schools. "Students and parents may discover a new sense of educational purpose and a vision of a better future" (p. 163).

A second way we are seeing the nature of partnerships change is movement toward social responsibility. Business leaders have discovered that their involvement with schools has reshaped their sense of social responsibility (Broder; Jones and Maloy). James Renier, Chairman of Honeywell, Inc., opened The New Vista school for teenage mothers in the

Honeywell corporate headquarters. Renier also served as head of a Committee for Economic Development (CED) task force that published *The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education* (1991). In the task force report, he and two hundred fifty other leading business executives concluded that the piecemeal efforts to remove one or another roadblock from a child's path to adult citizenship and economic self-reliance will not succeed (Broder).

The broader vision is for business-education-community partnerships. Based upon the CED recommendations and his conversation with Renier, Broder goes on to state:

> Even more than the system needs additional money, he and his colleagues concluded, it must be redesigned to do two things. First, it has to reach out into the community to enable parents, especially those with meager educations of their own, to avail themselves of the services their children need. Second, it must deliver continuing social services at school to help youngsters become active, eager students while allowing teachers to concentrate on their real job of education. The social service agencies already exist in most communities, but too often are not readily available at school sites. (p. A 13)

Several authors agree that there had been a collapse of civic virtue in the society around us, a collapse into expressive and competitive individualism, and a loss of integrated vision (Bellah, 1985; Elkind, 1984; Magner, 1991). Magner states, "when it comes to drugs, crime, aids, racial harassment, and other crisis in American life, the needs of the community must be reasserted, but only in ways that infringe as little as possible on individual rights" (p. A3). This renewed sense of social responsibility and community is reflected in the learner outcomes and processes deemed important to new designs for the comprehensive high school.

The third way in which we are seeing a paradigm shift in the partnership movement is the strong interest in learner outcomes and learning processes (Berryman, 1988; Raizen, 1989; Resnick, 1987). Researchers are refreshing the public's interest in the importance of context and experience. There is renewed interest in integrating vocational and academic education as a way to transform and strengthen both. Resnick made the case clearly in her 1987 presidential address to the American Education Research Association. She said:

> I looked for elements common to programs that could point cumulatively toward a theory of how learning and thinking skills are acquired. I found three key features. First, most of the effective programs have features characteristic of out-of-school cognitive performances. They involve

> socially shared intellectual work, and they are organized around joint accomplishment of tasks, so that elements of the skill take on meaning in the context of the whole. Second, many of the programs have elements of apprenticeship. That is, they make usually hidden processes overt, and they encourage student observation and commentary. They also allow skill to build up bit by bit, yet permit participation even for the relatively unskilled, often as a result of the social sharing of tasks. Finally, the most successful of the programs are organized around particular bodies of knowledge and interpretation—subject matters, if you will - rather than general abilities. (p. 18)

Seeley, (1985, 1989), clarifies the fourth way we see a paradigm shift in partnerships: the importance of reconceptualizing education as a partnership rather than the present governmental service delivery system. Seeley feels that genuine partnership is driven out of education as schools, parents, and students come to think of their relationships in terms of service delivery—of *provider* and *client*, of *professionals* and *target populations* (1985, p. 65). Seeley goes on to say that the concept of service delivery, unlike that of partnership, leads to conflict-producing ambiguities about whether provider or client wields more power in the relationship. This reconceptualization to a partnership model does not imply that government, bureaucracy, or professionalism will disappear from education. They cannot, however, be ends in themselves, but must be looked upon as means to achieve ends grounded in the interests of parents, students, citizens, and teachers.

A fifth dimension of paradigm shift in partnerships is the shift to an ecological view of education. The ecological view (Davies, NASBE) recognizes the interrelatedness of the multiple institutions and sectors of society, and the strengths and expertise of families, communities, businesses, and postsecondary institutions to contribute to the personal, academic, vocational, and social development of students. The ecological view offers an expanded view of the learning environment and engaging learning experiences which are contextual and experiential.

Finally, the literature reviewed for this paper on partnerships points to a sixth way we see a paradigm shift: the implementation of a *bottom-up* strategy for educational reform. Successful educational partnerships where the rhetoric does not belie the reality, involve all stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, in genuine communication and in the designing and implementing of improvement strategies (Corrigan & Mobley, 1990; Seeley, 1985).

Conclusions About Partnerships

Educational partnerships are a promising way of working together that are both old and new. Partnerships with families, communities, businesses, elementary schools, junior high schools, and postsecondary educational institutions could contribute to the achievement of learner outcomes and facilitate learner processes such as providing learning that is engaging, contextual, and experiential. A comprehensive, ecological approach to school reform will require movement from partnerships that are merely communicative and cooperative to those that are collaborative or integrative. The following summary the literature on educational partnerships, issues surrounding successful implementation, and possible design specifications sh[illegible]ide our design efforts.

Summary

1. Several terms are used interchangeably with the word partnership or are used to describe a particular level of association of interrelationships. Some of these are cooperative, network, linkage, collaborative, consortium, coalition, and alliance. This use of multiple terms can be problematic and requires that partners clarify terms as they begin to work together.

2. Partnerships can be classified by the degree or intensity of relationship; ranging from separation (no interaction) to integration (symbiotic relationship). With an increase in degree or intensity comes more commitment by the partners to share information and resources; to modify the individual organizations to accommodate mutual goals and objectives; and, to be mutually accountable to reach joint goals.

3. Partnerships can be described as having a life span. Some partnerships are short-term relationships that are project-specific, while others are growing, evolving, long-term relationships that start small, and through sustained hard work and building of trust, become complex, comprehensive, multi- dimensional relationships.

4. General features that characterize collaborative partnerships are: shared goals; mutual respect and trust; cooperative effort; shared power; a contribution of varying talents, perspectives, and resources from each partner; and, shared accountability.

5. While the idea of collaboration or integration is attractive, the reality is that collaborative work is often difficult and complex and often involves ambiguities related to goals and motivations.

6. Collaborative partnerships will require time to develop. Time together is required of partners to learn to be reflective instead of protective; to become comfortable with each other's context and goals; and, to understand each other's perspectives. Time will also be required for training in collaborative work and for cooperative planning, implementation, and evaluation.

7. An historical perspective of partnerships in education can give some clues as to the barriers that might be experienced in movement to collaborative work and what might be learned from efforts that have been successfully implemented in the past. For example, a barrier exists in movement to a partnership model of education in that during the last century education has been conceptualized as a service-delivery model rather than as a partnership. Movement to a partnership model of education will require a reorientation of educators, parents, administrators, and students away from a service-delivery model. The success of apprenticeships, mentorships, and experiential learning opportunities used in the past is renewing interest in replicating these methods in today's educational system.

8. There seems to be a paradigm shift in partnerships occurring that involves the following features: (a) movement away from activity-specific partnerships toward collaborative partnerships; (b) a movement toward social responsibility; (c) a strong interest in learner outcomes and learning processes; (d) a reconceptualization of education from a service delivery model to a partnership model; and (e) a *bottom-up* strategy for change.

Issues

The study of partnerships raises problematic issues and suggests the following questions for continuing discussions among educators and their partners.

1. The research indicates that sustained collaborative work must come with a *want-to, want-to* motivation rather than an *ought-to* or *obliged to* orientation. Can partnerships that are mandated by top-down pressure for organizational

collaboration such as state policy requirements be successful in an atmosphere of *ought to* or *obliged to*?

2. Partners need to communicate well and have a history of cooperative association before the trust and ground work are built to operate at a collaborative level. Are schools and potential partners ready and able to commit the time and the training necessary to sustain collaborative partnerships? Why are schools often leery of business and industry forming partnerships in education?

3. Some of the most creative, effective partnerships involve unlike partners approaching the goals and problems being addressed from varying perspectives. How can the stereotypes and misconceptions held by educators and potential partners be stripped away so that effective partnerships can be formed? How can we deal with the ambiguity that naturally exists when people from different backgrounds want to work as partners?

4. Are educators willing to move from a service delivery model (provider and client, professional and target audience) to a partnership model (shared power, goals, and accountability) of education?

5. Collaborative partnerships are not a quick-fix for educational improvement. How can we move from rhetoric to actually implementing collaborative partnerships? How do we find mechanisms for fair and equitable practices that involve all stakeholders in educational reform?

Design Specifications

New Designs for the Comprehensive High School hopes to provide design and development specifications for the comprehensive high school for the twenty-first century. The program of research includes six phases; these are the desired learner outcomes, learning process, organization and partnerships, staff and staff development, facilities and supplies, and cost. The Design Group members and research staff have used a design-down strategy for this project. The design-down strategy requires designers to begin with a vision for a symbol, signature, or student most representative of the aims and goals of the school designs. "New Designs..." has kept the characteristics of several such symbols in mind—the one-room school, a soaring eagle, the grin of self confidence, Leonardo da

Vinci and Yoda—and envisions such symbols displayed on the keystone of the new schools. The above mentioned phases are represented as the blocks in the supporting archway.

Once the most desired learner outcomes, learning processes, and organizing patterns were selected, provisional design specifications were established. The research team became most aware that the organization and partnerships for the new high school designs would be substantially different from the conventional practices of schools. It would be impossible to achieve the active, experiential, and collaborative aspects of school with organizations that were bound by the typical high school facility, or through partnerships that were divorced from the learning and teaching processes.

From the sources reviewed for this working paper on partnership ideas for "New Designs..." and with the guidance of the Design Group members, we suggest that partnerships for the comprehensive high school of the future should be consistent with the following design specifications. It is our determination, at this time, that the specifications will be representative of collaborative partnerships.

The design specifications for collaborative partnerships fall naturally into two interacting categories: (a) specifications for practice, and (b) characteristics of partners.

Specifications for Practice:

1. Statement of common goals that is clear and concise and that is recognized and developed cooperatively.

2. Assessment of the talents and resources each partner possesses and is willing to commit to the partnership.

3. Provision of sufficient time and in-service training to plan, sustain, enhance, and evaluate the partnership.

4. Cooperative effort involving all key players that utilizes the talents of the partners in the effort.

5. On-going communication that is inclusive of all individuals and institutions in the partnership.

6. Sharing of responsibility and accountability.

7. Periodic evaluation of the collaborative process.

8. Celebrations of successes.

9. Identifying possibilities for future collaborative work.

Characteristics of Partners:

1. Belief in the ability of partners to bridge different institutional cultures for a specified purpose.

2. Evidence of mutual respect and trust among partners often built through prior associations.

3. Realistic expectations of the partnership; recognizing that successful partnerships often build from small success into multi-dimensional efforts.

As "New Designs . . ." continue to develop from the design-down strategy, the specifications for partnerships will be tested and re-tested for consistency with the emerging structures. The partnership specification must fit into and add strength to the emerging high school structures.

References

Ascher, C. (1988). *Urban school-community alliances: Trends and issues.* (Information Series No. 10). New York, NY: Columbus University, Teachers College. (ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education).

Bacon, K. H. (1990, July 31). Many educators view involved parents as key to children's success in school. *Wall Street Journal*, p. 31.

Bauch, J. P. (1989). The TransParent school model: New technology for parent involvement. *Educational Leadership, 47*(2), 32-34.

Beatty, A. J. (1918). *Corporation schools.* Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Bellah, R. N., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Benson, C. S. (1991). *Current state of occupational and technical training: The need for integration and high quality programs.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Council of Chief State School Officials. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Benson, P. (1990). *The troubled journey: A portrait of 6th–12th grade youth.* Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute.

Berryman, S. E. (1988). *Education and the economy: What should we teach? When? How? To Whom?* New York, NY: Columbia University, National Center in Education and Employment.

Boo, M. R., & Docker, L. E. (1985). *The learning community.* Alexandria, VA: National Community Education Association.

Bragg, D. D., & Phelps, L. A. (1990, August). Tech prep: Definitions, models, and program strategies. *William C. Norris Institute Newsletter: Tech Prep Consortium*, pp. 8-9.

Broder, D. S. (1991, March 3). To secure the nation's future. *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, p. 24A.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1991). What do families do? *Family Affairs*, *4*(1), 1-6.

Bryant, S. J., & Mills, H. (1986, January). Working with teachers to connect the curriculum and the community. *Community Education Journal.*

Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988). *The high school as community: Contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

California Department of Education. (1991). *Roads to the future: Strategic plan for educational options in the 21st century*. (Report No. 7209). Sacramento, CA: Pacific Management and Research Associates.

Cavazos, L. E. (1989). *Educating our children: Parents and schools together*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Cetron, M., & Gayle, M. (1991). *Educational renaissance*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Collins, R. C. (1984). *Head start: A review of research with implications for practice in early childhood education*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association.

Committee for Economic Development. (1991). *The unfinished agenda: A new vision for child development and education*. New York, NY: Author.

Committee for Economic Development. (1985). *Investing in our children*. New York, NY: Author.

Conference Board. (1991). *Addressing new challenges for business in education reform: Responding to national and local initiatives.* Advance agenda for the Eighth General Business/Education Conference for March 19, 1992. New York, NY: Conference Board.

Congressional Record, 101st Congress 2nd Session. (1990, August 2). The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act Amendments of 1990.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1989). *High school community service: A review of research and programs.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center of Effective Secondary Schools.

Corrigan, D., & Mobley, W. (1990, August). *Educational reform agenda and partnerships.* Paper presented at the Conference on School-University Partnerships, Washington, DC.

Cremin, L. S. (1964). *The transformation of the school.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Davies, D. (1991, August). *Implementing a national strategy for school reform through family-community partnerships: The league of schools reaching out.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the School Psychology Division of the American Psychology Association, San Francisco, CA.

Day, P. R. (1985). *In search of community college partnerships: Keeping America working series, No. 2.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 616)

Donnelly, M. (1991). A running start. *Agenda, 1*(2), 44-49.

Dornbusch, S., Ritter, M., Lederman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development, 58,* 1244-1257.

Eagle, E. (1989, March). *Socioeconomic status and home environment: The correlates of student achievement.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Association, San Francisco, CA.

Education and Human Services Consortium. (1991). *What it takes: Structuring interagency partnerships to connect children and families with comprehensive services.* Washington, DC: Author.

Elkind, D. (1984). *All grown up & no place to go: Teenagers in crisis.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Epstein, J. (1983). *Effects on parents of teachers' practices in parent involvement.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Epstein, J. (1984, April). *Effects of teacher practices of parent involvement for change in student achievement in reading and math.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Association, New Orleans, LA.

Erickson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis.* New York, NY: Norton.

Eurich, N. P. (1985). *Corporate classrooms: The learning business.* Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fehrmann, P., Keith, T., & Reimers, T. (1987). Home influence on school learning: Direct and indirect effects of parental involvement on high school grades. *Journal of Educational Research, 80,* 330-337.

Ferrin, R., & Arbeiter, S. (1975). *Bridging the gap: A study of education-to-work linkages.* Princeton, NY: College Entrance Examination Board.

Freedman, M. (1991). Mentoring: New help for kids and schools. *Harvard Education Letter, 7*(2), 1-3.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gordon, J. (1991, Sept. 18). Education means more than a ready work force. *Minneapolis Star-Tribune*, A13.

Gordon, J. (1990). Can business save the schools? *Training*, 19-27.

Henderson, A. T., Marburger, C. L., & Ooms, T. (1986). *Beyond the bake sale: An educator's guide to working with parents.* Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Hoerner, J. L. (1991). Tech Prep: A viable solution for the forgotten half. *ATEA Journal, 18*(4), 18-20.

Hull, D. M. (1990, August). How many ways can you spell articulation? *William C. Norris Institute Newsletter: Tech Prep Consortium*, p. 11.

Jones, B. L., & Maloy, R. W. (1988). *Partnerships for improving schools.* New York, NY: Greenwood.

Karls, D. K. (1992). *Parents' experiences of involvement in the education of their high school sophomores.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN.

Kielsmeier, J. C., & Jackson, R. (1989, April). *Recommendations regarding youth entering service to American Foundation and National Youth Service.* Roseville, MN: National Youth Leadership Council.

Lieberman, A. (1986, February). Collaborative work. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5), 4-8.

Luce, J., Anderson, J., Pemaul, J., Shumer, R., Stanton, T., & Migliore, S. (Eds.). (1988). *Service learning: An annotated bibliography aligning public service with the curriculum.* Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Magner, D. K. (1991, February 13). Probing the imbalance between individual rights, community needs. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A3.

Maurice, C. F. (1984). *Private sector involvement with the vocational community: An analysis of policy options* (Information Series No. 281). Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University.

McAllister Swap, S. (1990). Comparing three philosophies of home-school collaboration. *Equity and Choice*, *6*(3), 9-19.

Meade, E. J. (1991, October). Foundations and the public schools: An impressionistic retrospective, 1960-1990. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *73*(2), K1-K12.

Merenda, D. W. (1989). Partners in education: An old tradition renamed. *Educational Leadership*, *47*(2), 4-7.

Mitchell, J. J. (1986). *The nature of adolescence*. Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Detsing Enterprises Limited.

Mitchell, V., Russell, E. S., & Benson, C. S. (1989). *Exemplary urban career-oriented secondary school programs*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Moles, O. C. (1990, April). *Disadvantaged parents' participation in their childrens' education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Nathan, J. (Ed.). (1989). *Public schools by choice: Expanding opportunities for parents, students, and teachers*. St. Paul, MN: Institute for Learning and Teaching.

National Alliance of Business. (1987). *The fourth r: Workforce readiness; a guide to business-education partnerships*. Washington, DC: author.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1990). *Partners in educational improvement: Schools, parents, and the community*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

New American School Development Corporation. (1991, October). *NASDC Update*. Arlington, VA: Author.

Olson, L. (1990, April). Parents as partners: Redefining the social contract between families and schools. *Education Week*, pp. 17-24.

Opachinch, C. A., & Linksz, J. J. (1974). *A handbook for articulating high school and community college programs*. Catonsville, MD: Catonsville Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 104 455)

Raizen, S. A. (1989). *Reforming education for work: A cognitive science perspective*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Resnick, L. B. (1987). Learning in and out of school. *Educational Researcher, 16*(9), 13-20.

Rich, D. (1988). *MegaSkills: How families can help children succeed in school and beyond*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Robertson-Smith, M. (1990). *Articulation models for vocational education* (Report No. 343). Columbus: Ohio State University, Center for Education and Training for Employment. (ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education)

Rumburger, R. W. (1987). High school dropouts: A review of issues and evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 57*, 101-121.

Scott-Jones, D. (1988, Winter). Families as educators: The transition from informal to formal school learning. *Educational Horizons, 46*, 66-69.

Seeley, D. (1989). A new paradigm for parent involvement. *Educational Leadership, 47*(2) 46-48.

Seeley, D. (1985). *Education through partnership*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Shanker, A. (1990). A proposal for using incentives to restructure our public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(5), 345-357.

Small, S. A., & Eastman, G. (1991). Rearing adolescents in contemporary society: A conceptual framework for understanding the responsibilities and needs of parents. *Family Relations, 40*, 455-462.

Smith, T. J., & Trist, C. (1988). *Training and educating the work force in the nineties: The rationale for public-private collaboration.* (Information Series No. 331). Columbus: Ohio State University, Center for Education and Training for Employment. (ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Career, and Vocational Education)

Smith, S. C., & Scott, J. J. (1990). *The collaborative school: A work environment for effective instruction/education management.* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Tivnan, T., & Pierson, D. E. (1982, March). *Evaluation of a school-based early education program: Results from the Brookline early education project.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Association, New York, NY.

Turnbaugh, A. (1987, Spring). *Resource Bulletin.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center of Effective Secondary Schools.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education.* Harvard University Press.

United States Department of Education. (1988). *America's Schools: Everybody's Business.* Washington, DC: Author.

Weisman, J. (1991a). Consultants launch for-profit effort to access school-business partnerships. *Education Week, 11*(9), 4.

Weisman, J. (1991b, March 13). Business's words, actions to improve education at odds, economist argues. *Education Week*, (25), 26-27.

Willis, S. (1991, September). Vocational education: Applied academics, tech-prep programs serve the "forgotten half." *ASCD Curriculum Update*, pp. 1-8.

Withers, A. (1991). *Minnesota agriculture in the classroom: A partnership in education.* (Available from A. Withers, 90 West Plato Boulevard, St. Paul, MN 55107).

W. T. Grant Foundation. (1991). *States and communities on the move: Policy initiatives to create a world-class workforce.* Washington, DC: Commission of Work and Family and Citizenship.